Vol. XI, No. 22 HUMAN EVENTS June 2, 1954

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PRIMARIES; 1954

by "OBSERVER"

THEY BEGAN in April and will continue through September — the primary campaigns. Those of the Democratic party should be of special interest because they will be "free" for the first time in twenty years. The Democratic voters may employ that freedom to give the public some surprises.

The President cannot exactly control the selection of candidates of his own party, but he does have a large measure of influence, by virtue of the patronage at his disposal and from his ability to make policy. Through this influence President Roosevelt and President Truman were in general able to secure the nomination of Democratic Representatives and Senators who supported their internationalist policies. There is nevertheless reason to believe that in the North and West the bulk of Democratic voters would have preferred greater devotion to American interests, and that the use of their voting strength to support internationalism has been highly anomalous.

The primaries of 1954 will afford opportunity to the Democrats to show their true desires and may pave the way toward bringing the anomaly to an end.

The assertion that the Democratic voters of the North and West lack sympathy for the party's internationalism is based partly on analogy. In European industrial countries with universal suffrage it is the parties of the masses and the lower middle classes that are nationalistic and historically opposed to international activity. Such activity has, in those countries, been associated both with trade and, in greater or less degree, with colonialism either through direct control or by ownership of natural resources accompanied by political influence, e.g., the British in Iran and Argentina.

It is the masses who must provide the troops these international adventures so often require, and the foreign service of an enlisted man is not nearly so much fun as that of an officer or a bureaucrat; the thought of their fellow countrymen lording it over "natives" and foreigners does not appeal to the egalitarian masses; imports from abroad often have an adverse effect on domestic wage levels; rightly or wrongly, even the workers in export industries have rarely seen the advantage of foreign endeavors. The intellectual champions of the masses, although often internationalist in the abstract, have been offended by the anti-democratic features of internationalism in practical application. At present these intellectuals associate internationalism with the rich, capitalistic and uncultured United States.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The patriotism of the masses has therefore taken the form of what is known as nationalism. They are quite willing to fight to protect their country; they eagerly want their fellow citizens to win in international sport and other contests; they believe themselves superior to all foreigners and are more or less zenophobic; they would prefer to see the cost of foreign adventure spent at home.

ALTHOUGH this analysis has been made in very general terms and is subject to exceptions, its validity as applied to Great Britain and Germany can readily be seen. It might be argued that the analysis is disproved by the success of the Communist parties with the masses in France and Italy. But there the Communists, who understand these things very clearly, purport to be violently nationalistic. The Soviet is concealed; no one is more pro-French or more pro-Italian than the Communist parties of those nations; they depict the parties favoring cooperation with the United States as internationalist, as betraying the interests of their countries in favor of Washington.

The parties of the upper classes, on the other hand, have supported international activity. The upper classes have foreign investments, often very lucrative; they include manufacturers in search of foreign markets and bankers who profit from international transactions; individually they can often engage in more distinguished and more comfortable careers in the foreign or colonial sections of the state and corporation bureaucracies; they like to travel and to throw their weight around; their education tends to give them a cosmopolitan outlook.

In the United States events moved in accordance with this analysis when the Republican Administration of McKinley annexed the Philippines and Puerto Rico, sent troops to suppress the Boxer Rebellion and in general asserted itself in world affairs. The Democrats were also consistent when they opposed McKinley in the election of 1900 on the issue of "imperialism." But McKinley's foreign policy did not have sufficient domestic impact to give the Democrats a victory.

On the other hand, it was out of character for the Democratic party to take the country into two world wars, neither of which indisputably endangered the vital interests of the United States, and thereafter to sponsor elaborate international commitments and operations which, since World War II, have been most expensive. Similarly it could hardly have been anticipated by the political scientist that President Truman would appear so little agitated by the problem of Communist infiltration — not an internationalist so much as an anti-nationalist attitude highly offensive to the masses.

Lack of space precludes discussion of World War I and its aftermath other than to note that in the election of 1920, in which the Democratic party was clearly internationalist while the Republicans equivocated, the masses deserted the Democratic party wholesale.

The reason for the Democratic anomaly in the World War II period and beyond has been partly the influence of the intelligentsia and partly a series of tricks. But in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1954, without control of the White House, the influence of the intelligentsia with the Democratic voters has diminished, and the tricks cannot be played. Let us consider the situation in a little detail.

THE INTELLECTUALS always had an important role in the Roosevelt Administration. President Roosevelt, because of his anti-business attitude, could not, or at least did not, rely substantially on business for his administrative personnel. That attitude won him the adherence of the intelligentsia, and he turned largely to them for his subordinates. The intelligentsia, whose foreign policy views had in the past varied considerably, became violently internationalist as a result of abhorrence of Hitler, blindness toward Stalin and the German conquests of 1940.

Their influence, President Roosevelt's boredom with domestic problems, the support of the Democrats of the South, where the party is partly the party of the upper classes, induced and enabled President Roosevelt to adopt and effectuate the policy of intervention.

President Truman inherited the policy willy-nilly. He realized, however, its unpopularity with the masses. There is reason to suspect that at the time of the appointment of Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense he hoped to disengage the party. The fury of the intelligentsia with Johnson was so great that Truman concluded he would lose their support if he weakened his internationalist policy. He accordingly dismissed Johnson, but during political campaigns he did endeavor to focus attention on issues other than foreign policy and kept Secretary Acheson under wraps.

But the influence of the intelligentsia has been exerted *through* the President. There is little reason to think that the intelligentsia have direct influence with the masses, who are not reached by the intellectual publicists.

And it was the Presidents who played the tricks. Thus, President Roosevelt won the election of 1940 by disguising his purposes and that of 1944 by pleading for unity. The distaste of the masses for Democratic foreign policy — among other things — was reflected in the disastrous results of 1946. President Truman's victory in 1948 may be attributed to his ability to keep domestic issues in the forefront, aided, to be sure, by the ineptness of the Republicans. In 1950 the election was confused and more or less of a standoff. In 1952 the Republicans finally campaigned and won on nationalist pretensions, although their candidate was an internationalist who adopted internationalist policies upon taking office. The Democratic candidate was himself an intellectual and a strong and sincere internationalist; it is not without significance that even he did not call on the anti-nationalist Secretary Acheson.

THE TRICKS thus were played by the Presidents. In 1954 the Democrats suffer from a double handicap: they do not have a President to play tricks and there do not seem to be any tricks left to play.

A new factor, too, seems applicable in 1954, viz., the identification of the Republican party with internationalism. In that party the Eastern and Pacific Coast elements have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long been internationalist because of the same factors that affect the upper classes of European countries. Through the internationalist policy of recent years export manufacturers and the international banks have made large profits; the State and Defense Departments, ECA, CIA and other Government agencies dealing with foreign affairs have provided interesting and often luxurious employment for many well-educated people; others, particularly women, have experienced delightful sensations of gratification at the major role the country has been playing in world affairs.

The anomaly has been that the Republicans of the Middle West are so nationalistic. Their remoteness from foreign countries, the lesser influence of the international banks and the predominantly domestic character of their industries are among the explanations of this phenomenon. A strong internationalist element nevertheless exists among the Middle West Republicans, especially in those centers, such as Detroit, which have high hopes of greater export business. As President Eisenhower is also an internationalist, it seems most probable that the party will take on an increasing internationalist character during his Administration.

For the first time in many years, the Democratic Party, freed of that central influence which has so stimulated the selection of internationalist candidates, can now swing over to a foreign policy more in keeping with the instincts of its voters. Each candidate may choose the issues that he thinks most likely to win him votes. There have been indications that the men of the people might try to take party policy away from the intelligentsia. Massachusetts State Treasurer Furcolo, for instance, recently asked the ADA please to leave the party alone. Mr. Furcolo is a candidate for the Senate seat now held by Senator Saltonstall.

The difficulty is that there is no articulate, nationally publicized Democrat to lead the party back to nationalism. Senator McCarran is too old and has his hands full in Nevada. Governor Lausche seems busy in Ohio. It is a peculiar fact that the man best equipped for such a task, Senator McCarthy, is a Republican, one of the strange results brought about by the transposition of normal alignments which has characterized our politics since 1936. McCarthy is a man of the people and his appeal, based on a passionate nationalism, is essentially to the masses.

Should the Democrats develop a trend toward nationalism, their logical Presidential candidate in 1956 should be Governor Lausche. He would be a formidable candidate, a winner, as things look now, in the Middle West and the North East; where, it is interesting to note, he pleases some of the old Taft following.

The writer is a former official in the Truman Administration — he is one of the very few whom the "liberals" in the new regime did not want as a "holdover."

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. XI, No. 22 | Wednesday, June 2, 1954 | Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF JUN 9 1954 LIBRARY

The Big Issue: It is now obvious that the Administration, striving desperately to down Senator McCarthy, has embarked upon a series of moves which, if successful will take the nation a long way toward dictatorial government.

These moves are depicted as an effort of President Eisenhower to shield himself from a McCarthy "domination" of the Republican Party which, of course, is sheer moonshine. Back of these moves are the left wing groups that have successfully penetrated the Republican Party and who see in Senator McCarthy a chance to build an omnipotent Executive who will have the power to hasten the establishment of a socialist State in America.

The McCarthy-Army clash was grist for the mill of the White House left-wingers. As tensions mounted, the Truman "gag" ordinance was invoked to prevent the Committee from finding out what happened at the conference of January 21. This ordinance had been flayed by the Republicans in the 1952 campaign as a long step toward a totalitarian State.

Then Senator Prescott Bush, the internationalist from Connecticut, reportedly inspired by the Palace Guard, dropped a bill into the hopper to revise congressional hearings so as to protect witnesses, and this touched off a war whoop from such left-wingers as Senator Kefauver, Humphrey and Murray; they had ideas on how to make congressional committees impotent. The Bush ideas were sufficient, but the Democratic left-wingers tried to gild the lily for party reasons. Then Attorney General Brownell stepped in with his extraordinary charge, that McCarthy was upsetting the Constitutional balance of power between the Executive and Congress, was in fact usurping Executive power in receiving data from informants in the Pentagon about ignored FBI reports.

Brownell's statement, in the opinion of eminent Constitutional lawyers consulted by HUMAN EVENTS, is absurd. Open the American Constitution. The first article deals with Congress, the second with the Executive and the third with the Judiciary. The Founding Fathers intended that Congress was to be the most important part of the Government, and that one of its chief duties should be to keep a sharp watch on the Executive (the historical source of dictatorial power). Congress established the permanent body known as the Government Operations Committee in both the Senate and the House. The function of these Committees is to ferret out wrongdoing in the Executive. The Constitution specifically gives Congress the power to impeach either the Chief Executive or any subordinate, and all Federal Judges, including those of the Supreme Court.

This power obviously cannot be exercised unless Congress can have access to facts of wrongdoing in the Executive or the Judiciary. Any informant, therefore, in the Executive who gives either of the permanent Government Operations Committees (and McCarthy is Chairman of the Senate Committee) information about the Executive is *not* giving such information to an unauthorized person. He is giving it to an authorized person, and the chairman of a group set up by Congress for the express purpose of enabling Congress to perform its Constitutional mission of uncovering wrongdoing in the Executive, and such an informant is not interfering with the enforcement of the law by the Executive but merely reporting to the Congress failure of such enforcement.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitutional lawyers note that the Executive gives a warped impression of our form of Government; it talks of the "separation of powers," but says nothing of the "checks and balances."

Historically, autocratic government is fashioned when the Executive of a free government is able to reduce a parliament or congress to impotence. Legislative bodies are normally the defenders of freedom. Executives invariably strive to bring legislative bodies under control and enhance their own power until it becomes sufficient to shape legislation.

The American Executive is already possessed of enormous economic power — a condition which the Constitutional fathers never intended — and, through the exercise of this enormous power, the nation witnessed numerous "rubber stamp" Congresses under the New Deal. But if the White House Palace Guard can win the fight to reduce congressional investigating committees to impotence, confirm the power of the President to "gag" all Federal employees so that they cannot give information to such congressional committees, and finally make it a crime (and that is the real objective of the Brownell statement) for anyone in the Executive Branch to give evidence of any wrongdoing to the chairman of a congressional committee — then the American Presidency will be able to operate in the dark and pressure Congress into following its dictation.

What the Palace Guard is attempting is to make the White House into a Bergen with only Charlie McCarthys in Congress — not Joe McCarthys.

Rights of Congressional Probers: Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, mentioned these days as a possible candidate again from Montana, blasts the Eisenhower Administration today in an interview with HUMAN EVENTS. The President last week said that no employee of the Executive Branch had the right to give information directly to any member of Congress. Wheeler, who starred in 1924-5 as Senatorial investigator of the famous Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil scandals, takes vigorous exception to the President's stand.

"Our probes in the Twenties," he said, "depended vitally on information given us from minor officials of the Department of Interior, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. When Senator Tom Walsh, my colleague from Montana, and myself prepared to reveal the fraudulent giving away of our oil resources by a member of the Cabinet we would have had a virtually impossible task in gathering data without the same sort of informants from within the Executive arm, as Eisenhower now condemns."

Wheeler, a Democrat, went on to describe how he and Walsh demanded data from Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty, and the latter refused — imposed a gag rule similar to that of Truman and Eisenhower. "We took the matter up with President Coolidge (a Republican) and he fired Daugherty. He replaced him with Harlan F. Stone, later to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; and Stone readily gave us whatever information we wanted. Secretary of the Interior Fall was forced out of office and later was convicted of receiving a bribe and served his time in the penitentiary."

Wheeler concluded: "This issue of the right of Congress to receive information from officials in the Executive arm of the Government is precious, of the highest importance. The Congress has the Constitutional right and duty to check on what goes on in the Executive and to receive such information. Without this, congressional investigations would be crippled. It is disturbing that the President and so many people fail to realize this."

Not Merely Gossip: The firing of Atomic Scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer came as a surprise here, for there have been rumors in the town for some time that the White House sought to have him completely cleared. It is believed that strong pressure was exerted to this end. Credit for victory is given partly to (1) Atomic Commission Chief Lewis Strauss who fought stubbornly for years to bring the Oppenheimer case to a decision; and partly (2) to the board of which Gordon Gray, North Carolina educator, is a member. On Capitol Hill, the moral is drawn: in view of the shocking facts revealed about the associations of this atomic expert, the delving to root out security risks must go on.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Our Wall Street correspondent reports intense disappointment in the business community with Ike's speech at Columbia University over last weekend. Business had looked forward to some definite word on the Indo-China situation, and got nothing. In Washington, observers who watch the Cohn-Schine hearings stand aghast at Ike's dig about "censorship," obviously referring to McCarthy and the crackdown on Communists. They see as foremost the White House "gag rule" on information to probe bodies fully authorized to receive such information. Censorship has now become definitely identified with the Executive.

● In the Army and Navy Club, there are voiced many misgivings about the proposed venture into Indo-China on the ground that meanwhile we face danger in Korea. Officers returning from that peninsula say we have been weakening our forces there while the enemy has strengthened its offensive power.

One for Ripley: Our attention has been called to a bulletin put out by the Atlantic Union Committee for April, 1954. In a small block on Page 1, we read under the heading "AUC Contributions Deductible" the following: "All members will be glad to hear that the Department of Internal Revenue has now granted the AUC (Atlantic Union Committee) tax exemption. . . . This ruling will make it possible for many members to increase the size of their contributions over previous years and we hope will make it possible for us to expand our activities and do a bigger job."

The Atlantic Union Committee spends many thousands of dollars annually propagandizing the American people to abandon the Constitution and go into a common government with England, Canada, France, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg — for a starter. It thus serves as the opening wedge for world government. Perhaps it is not so astonishing that the Atlantic Union should receive a tax exempt status under the Eisenhower Administration. For some time we have been pointing out that the Eisenhower Administration is honeycombed with world government advocates and that next year, it is expected, the big push will be on when the internationalists will make their supreme effort to destroy American sovereignty by making us a part of a world government.

On what legal basis can tax exemption be justified for Atlantic Union? It is an organization whose whole program is political from beginning to end; it lobbies ceaselessly on Capitol Hill. Tax exemption was never intended for organizations whose sole business is the promotion of political objectives. That it should be conferred on an organization which seeks to destroy the American Constitution and American sovereignty is one for Ripley.

Genius for What? This week's *Saturday Evening Post* runs an article entitled "Dr. Marvin's Genius Factory." It is a good piece of publicity for Marvin's "show." It should help enrollment at George Washington University which is the "factory" referred to in the title. Particularly when the prospective student reads: "Over half of its graduates go into Uncle Sam's employ." Moreover, "three out of every four people at G.W. . . . hold down jobs on a full or part time basis." What could be better than rubbing elbows with students who are themselves "retired admirals and generals, diplomats, attorneys and businessmen who, already experts in their fields, take advantage of the university's location (in downtown Washington) to update their education?"

The suggested inference is that George Washington University is a good institution to attend if you want to be a bureaucrat or a more successful one. Many denizens of the Washington maze send their offspring there, and so do dignitaries of other lands who domicile in this city on the Potomac. This is where one meets the right kind of people. "If the country is to be run by a committee, be sure to get on the committee," and one way to get on is to enroll in G.W.

We know about G.W. through a student. When he was about sixteen, he showed a keen interest in and unusual knowledge of the free economy. He could tell you all about government incompetence and skullduggery, and why a people are in good case only when their government tends to its knitting. He had read more along these lines than the average postgraduate at G.W. does.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before his college career had hardly started he was drafted, and for two years he was stationed abroad. When he got back he showed signs of having undergone a change; he was restless and undecided as to what to do with himself. Somewhere along the line of duty he had lost that bitter attitude to the bark of the top sergeant which he had expressed on being drafted. Apparently, he had made an adjustment. For, shortly after his return he decided that "foreign service" was a good place for a young man. He explained that he would go into it for a while, so as to "learn the ropes," and then would enter the export business; this, of course, was to justify to himself the conflict between his previous frame of mind and his new one.

He enrolled in G.W., meanwhile taking an underling's job in Acheson's State Department. We met him a year later and noticed immediately that the metamorphosis was almost complete; he changed the subject when we maliciously brought up some of the ideas he espoused before he came to Washington and enrolled in G.W. He avoided us thereafter; he was "on the committee," and we were not.

Dr. Marvin, the President of this University, so says the article, once detected a Communist cell on the campus and weeded it out. But, what kind of mind is being turned out in his "factory"?

TV Front: Our Associate Editor, Frank Chodorov, will appear on the "Author Meets Critics" program, Sunday, June 13, for a discussion of his book *The Income Tax: Root of All Evil.* Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah will participate as a "pro-critic" and Sylvia Porter of the *New York Post* as "anti-critic." The program will be televised over the Dumont network from 7:00 to 7:30.

Book Front: A distinguished retired U.S. Army general, William H. Wilbur, has written an interesting book entitled *Guide Posts to the Future* — A New American Policy (Henry Regnery Company, Chicago. Price—$2.50), the best part of which concerns U. S. foreign policy. While the General's recommendations contain some muddy thinking (*vide* his proposal to keep U. S. membership in the UN, purely as a "forum") many of his thoughts reveal a certain realism which often marks men of our armed services.

Thus, Wilbur advances a plea to take all foreign policies away from UN action and to execute any agreements through treaties directly between the U. S. and individual foreign nations. The General deems regional arrangements of a multilateral nature as only a second best procedure, but prefers them infinitely to working through the UN. In general, he shows no faith in multilateral agreements.

He remarks: "Direct action with individual nations has been the normal method of carrying on diplomatic relations in the past. Experience has proven that it is the best way to accomplish solid permanent results. Each nation has special problems, special fears, special objectives which are particular to it. If an attempt is made to make an omnibus agreement with a number of nations, the result is often a compromise or a long delay with many times no result at all . . ."

The General attaches what he calls a Foreign Policy Experience Chart, showing the superiority of unilateral over multilateral agreements, and from the standpoint of the national interests of the U. S. Thus under a column marked "Separate American Action" are listed as "successes," the following: "Truman Deal on Greece," "Aid to Turkey," "Berlin Airlift," "German Banking System," "Change of Orders to the Seventh Fleet." The Marshall Plan is labelled "partial success," which is debatable. As failures, he selects the following: "Secret Yalta Agreement," "Potsdam Agreement," "Libya's Case," "Syria and Lebanon," "Covenant on Human Rights," and most of the international agreements of the Korean war. To those gradually awakening from the false dream of collective security and international organization, Wilbur's book should provide an effective *vade mecum.*

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED